

## REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and further examination of this application.

Regarding the objection to the drawings: Applicant submits herewith a Replacement Sheet that changes call-out number 24 on Figure 2 to call-out 23. Also, Applicant amends one paragraph of the Description to change “24” to “23”. Also, Applicant has amended the first paragraph of the Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments, in order to correct typographical errors and to remove unnecessary number 120. Support for “orientation 130” and “orientation 140” is in the application as filed, for example, in the last paragraph of page 8. No new matter is added. Applicant believes that these amendments solve the objections.

In response to the Section 112, second paragraph rejection: Applicant has removed the term “wrong” from the claims. The terms “right” and “wrong” are clearly explained in the application and are well-known in the sewing arts, but, in order to move the case ahead, Applicant now uses the terms “exposed” and “hidden” in their place.

Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly differentiate the claimed invention from the cited art. Support for all the claim amendments is in the original application, including in the original claims and drawings; no new matter has been added. None of the individual cited patents, and no combination of the cited patents, disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

*Constance* discloses a drape with multiple layers, but does not disclose or suggest two headings for attachment to a drapery rod, and does not disclose or suggest any reversible features (inside-out reversibility). While *Constance*’s layers could be switched during manufacture, such capability of switching layer orientation during manufacture does not reasonably equate to a reversible drape, which will be understood by those of skill in the art to mean reversible after manufacture. Especially, *Constance* does not disclose Applicant’s Claim 1 drape wherein the fabrics are sewn together at side seams and the drape is reversible through an opening in the drape, to achieve two alternative orientations, wherein a different one of the headings is exposed in each orientation but the other of the headings is enclosed and hidden from view. Also, *Constance* does not disclose Applicant’s Claim 12 drape that has a first heading at one end of the drape comprising said first decorative fabric and that is exposed and connectable to a drapery rod only when the drape is reversed to make the first decorative fabric visible on the front side of the drape, and that has a second heading at an opposing end of the drape comprising said second

decorative fabric and that is exposed and connectable to a drapery rod only when the drape is reversed to make the second decorative fabric visible on the front side of the drape.

*Mole* discloses a window hanging with multiple layers that are hook-and-loop-fastened together, so that the liner layer may be detached. *Mole* does not disclose or suggest two headings for attachment to a drapery rod, does not disclose multiple headings at opposite ends of the drape, and does not disclose or suggest any inside-out reversible features. Especially, *Mole* does not disclose Applicant's system in Claim 1 of reversing her drape through an opening in the drape to achieve two alternative orientations, wherein a different one of said multiple headings is exposed in each orientation but the other of the headings is enclosed and hidden from view. Also, *Mole* does not disclose Applicant's Claim 12 drape that has a first heading at one end of the drape comprising said first decorative fabric and that is exposed and connectable to a drapery rod only when the drape is reversed to make the first decorative fabric visible on the front side of the drape, and that has a second heading at an opposing end of the drape comprising said second decorative fabric and that is exposed and connectable to a drapery rod only when the drape is reversed to make the second decorative fabric visible on the front side of the drape.

*Nichols* discloses a curtain that has two rod-receiving pockets at opposite ends of the curtain, but *Nichols* does not disclose or suggest any inside-out reversible features. As opposed to Applicant's claimed structure, *Nichols*'s first and second headings are merely pockets at each end of the drape that are exposed external surfaces that are visible at all times. Especially, *Nichols* does not disclose or suggest Applicant's system in Claim 1 of reversing her drape through an opening in the drape to achieve two alternative orientations, wherein a different one of said multiple headings is exposed in each orientation but the other of the headings is enclosed and hidden from view. Also, *Nichols* does not disclose Applicant's Claim 12 drape that has a first heading at one end of the drape comprising said first decorative fabric and that is exposed and connectable to a drapery rod only when the drape is reversed to make the first decorative fabric visible on the front side of the drape, and that has a second heading at an opposing end of the drape comprising said second decorative fabric and that is exposed and connectable to a drapery rod only when the drape is reversed to make the second decorative fabric visible on the front side of the drape.

*Mole*'s drape is merely layers that are hook-and-loop-fastened together at their perimeter edges, but Applicant's invention as claimed in Claim 17 includes:


said first decorative fabric, second decorative fabric, and liner fabric are sewn together at left and right side edges, forming seams with raw edges, and wherein said raw edges are hidden inside the drape when the drape is in any of its reversible orientations;

wherein said drape has a first heading at one end of the drape, and a second heading at an opposing end of the drape, and wherein said opening is between said one end of the drape and said opposing end of the drape.

Further regarding Applicant's claimed opening, the opening is claimed as being between said one end of the drape and said opposing end of the drape (Claims 17 and 24); between opposite ends of the drape (Claim 23); or generally midway between said one end of the drape and said opposing end of the drape (Claim 25). *Mole*, on the other hand, could only reasonably be construed, if the hook-and-loop fastener were separated, to have an opening at an end of the drape rather than between ends.

Even if one were to combine *Constance* and *Mole*, which Applicant contends is not obvious to do, one would, at most, achieve a multiple-layer drape wherein the multiple layers are separable by hook-and-loop fastener. Even if one were to combine *Constance* and *Nichols*, which Applicant contends is not obvious to do, one would, at most, achieve a multiple layer drape sewn completely together with no openings, and having two always-exposed and always-visible headings. Even if one were to combine *Constance* and *Mole* and *Nichols*, which Applicant contends is not obvious to do, one would, at most, achieve a multiple-layer drape wherein the multiple layers could be separated by hook-and-loop fastener and wherein ends of the drapes are somehow formed into two always-exposed and always-visible headings.

Therefore, Applicant now believes the claims are novel and unobvious in view of the prior art. Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
 Date: June 12, 2008  
Ken J. Pedersen, Registration No. 29,689  
Barbara S. Pedersen, Registration No. 36,237  
P.O. Box 2666  
Boise, ID 83701-2666  
Telephone: 208-343-6355  
Facsimile: 208-343-6341